

# Contents

Page	
578	SEX FOR ITS OWN SAKE <i>The Editor</i>
581	AMERICA IN TORMENT <i>Edward Duff, S.J.</i>
591	AN INVITATION <i>J. M. Reid</i>
593	LESSON OF THE FORTY MARTYRS <i>Philip Caraman, S.J.</i>
598	SINO-SOVIET CRISIS <i>E. L. Way</i>
604	PRESENT DISCONTENTS: GENESIS AND HOPE <i>The Editor</i>
616	EARTHLY THINGS <i>Francis Fenn, S.J.</i>
621	THE NEW LITURGY— LOSS OR GAIN? <i>Denzil Galvin</i>
631	ANY QUESTIONS? <i>William Lawson, S.J.</i>
637	FULL OF SOUND AND FURY <i>Joseph Crean, S.J.</i>

**If You Change Your Address:**  
Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

**CHRISTIAN ORDER** is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

*Christian Order* is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

# Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane S J

---

VOLUME II.

OCTOBER 1970

NUMBER 10

---

## Sex for its Own Sake

THE EDITOR

SEX for its own sake is a lie. One would expect, it therefore, to be encouraged by the father of lies, who is the Devil. He exists to tempt men and draw them to destruction as the older spiritual writers, now so stupidly out of favour, had it so rightly. And the essence of temptation is to offer men fulfilment in the shape of that which cannot of its nature fulfil. Such is sex for its own sake. That is why the neurotic concentration on it in this country at the moment can be described with accuracy as diabolical. Its cruel logic is to drive men to despair. For they can never find the fulfilment they crave for as human beings in that which, of its very nature, is no more than a means to fulfilment. Frustration comes inevitably when the medium becomes the message and means become ends in themselves; sought, that is, for their own sake. Restlessness is inevitable under such circumstances. Men pass, in their boredom, to no more than other forms of sexual expression which bring a like emptiness. Titillation for its own sake can only breed despair. Sex loses all beauty when turned into a toy.

Sex, in all the beauty of its essence as a means, brings union in love to two and life to a third. Wonder and true

loveliness are here. The fulfilment of sex is in life and love. Where the attempt is made to take love out of context—for itself alone—through the denial of life, frustration is inevitable; for it is not love you are, in fact, left with, but love with life denied, therefore love incomplete, which is not true love; love as an end in itself, unrelated to completion through the donation of further life. About it, therefore, the smack of a lie.

I have been told that contraceptive marriages end far more frequently in divorce than others. I would expect them to do so. No one likes to live with a lie. I find it very hard to understand how Catholic advocates of contraception have fallen for the pretence that contraceptive love is true love; that it fulfils when, so patently, it does not. These have lowered love, I would say, to the level of sexual experience; sex, indeed, for its own sake, which is a lie. And by doing so, incidentally, they have left themselves with no defence against the current cult of sex for its own sake in any of its more sordid forms. I do not see, for example, how Catholic opponents of *Humanae Vitae* can oppose stage nudity, the homosexual relationship or the pornographic trade. They are in a mess on this score and they deserve to be, for their arguments against the Encyclical were without logic, made on the basis of a phoney situation-ethic, which bids man take as his guide what are, in fact, no more than momentary impulses.

There is a further presumption made by the opponents of *Humanae Vitae* that startles me. It does so because of its implied insult, which would seem to be that men and women in their sexual relations need to be released from the normal canons of *human* behaviour. In loving, these call for a tenderness in giving and taking of which instinct on its own is, of its very nature, incapable. What this means is that, in human loving, there must be the tender constraint that brings completion, not the snatch-and-grab of the barnyard; otherwise, love is not human and so not true. This is the ideal which Catholic teaching holds out to two in love; that they should be truly human in their loving and



find in the tender giving called for by the humanity of each, enriched by grace, the finest flowering of themselves. Not so, the secularist sexologist. Under his materialist microscope, a boy and girl in love are little more than high-grade animals who should let sex run free between them on a snatch-and-grab basis, with the pill provided to "save" them from its unwanted effects; each a sex-doll for the other, destined to live a lie that must end inevitably in frustration and despair.

In years to come Pope Paul will be thanked for many things; not least for having upheld, with such courage, in *Humanae Vitae*, the full splendour of married love.

---

## *Firm Ground under our Feet*

'History is so monotonous it makes you sick to read it. The more decent and honest a man is the worse he gets treated by his compatriots. The Roman consul Spurius Cassius Viscellinus wanted to give land to the common people, and the common people sent him to his death . . . [Many examples follow.] 'This kind of scepticism . . . sounds very clever and ruthless, but you must understand that by its very nature it dooms us to futility. It's not a guide to action, and people must have a set of beliefs to show them the way.'

'Even if they land in a swamp? Anything just to keep going, you mean?'

' . . . Look, I think scepticism is very important — it's a way of getting at people with one-track minds. But it can never give a man the feeling that he's got firm ground under his feet. And perhaps it's what we need — firm ground under our feet.' From *The First Circle*, by Alexander Solzhenitsyn (Fontana, pp. 88-89).

We hope this will be the first of a regular series of quarterly articles on the American scene by Father Edward Duff, S.J., who is no stranger to readers of *Christian Order*. In this first article, Father Duff deals perceptively with the cause and expression of unrest at present marking American life.

## America in Torment

by Edward Duff, S.J.

IN May 1970, The United States experienced what, newly returned from seven months in Europe, I described in a personal letter to the Editor of *Christian Order* as a "collective nervous breakdown". That rhetorical phrase was confirmed later in the month when the theme of the psychic health of the nation dominated discussions of the 7,000 members at the annual convention of the American Psychiatric Society; the Society's Trustees voted to spend the next two years studying violence, "seeking solutions to preserve man from his own destruction".

### *Earl Warren and the Crisis*

Comparisons are current to the trauma which followed President Kennedy's murder or the news of the destruction of the fleet at Pearl Harbour or the shock of the October 1928 stock market crash or even to the mood of inevitable conflict that brought about the Civil War. These indeed were defeats to the American spirit and tests of its toughness but they did not produce the degress of demoralisation, the failing faith in America's purpose and future which are at large today. The risk of subjectivism attached to such a judgement is allayed by the verdict of the recently retired Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Earl Warren, a man so wise and respected that he was the logical choice as chairman of the committee appointed by President Johnson to assure the country that all the circumstances of John F.

Kennedy's assassination would be thoroughly and impartially investigated. On May 15th Mr. Justice Warren began an address to a legal institute with the words: "We are, indeed, in a crisis. We have had many crises in prior years but none within the memory of Americans which compares with this one. A number of factors contribute to it — war, inflation, unemployment with resulting poverty, a deterioration of our environment, an atmosphere of repression and a divisiveness in our society to a degree of intensity that has not been equalled in the past hundred years".

It was no alienated intellectual, no enraged and posturing leader of a student commando who assessed the situation in the most solemn and sober terms. The Editors of *Fortune*, the expensive monthly published for the executives of the business community, "for the men in charge of change", declared in its June issue:

"For the first time, it is no longer possible to take for granted that the U.S. will somehow survive the crisis that grips it. The land itself will survive, of course, along with the machines and the people — or most of them. But no nation is merely, or mainly, an aggregation of its geography, its material assets, and its warm bodies. At the core of the U.S., conferring identity, cohesion and vitality, stands a Proposition: free men, despite differences of status, belief, and interest, can govern themselves. Upon the survival of the Proposition, confirmed by eight generations of superb achievements, depends any worthwhile future that an entity called the United States might have. And it is that Proposition—amazingly—which in the spring of 1970 has come to be at stake."

What the *Fortune* editorial is asserting is that the American society of shared presuppositions and common aspirations is now fragmented, its sectors opposed, hostile and distrustful.

### *The Two Catalysts*

The conquest of the American continent was marked



by violence, a characteristic reflected in the political life of the nation and evoked in the title of Professor Richard Hofstadter's book, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics* (Vantage Press, 1967). Perhaps "manic-depressive" might be the more apposite term. The original assumption that the Founding Fathers had created an eternal model of just government, free of the tyrannies of nobility and superstition, erecting a standard to which all honest men could repair was a birthright, if not a birthmark, of all Americans. It surfaced in the era of "manifest destiny" when the benefits of civilization were to be brought, presumably under Divine Providence, to the benighted victims of other peoples' colonialism; its arrogance was heard in the boast of "making the world safe for democracy" and in the public offer to defend free men anywhere in the world. And now the United States is doubting its capacity to heal its own wounds and recover its purpose. Rancorousness has replaced traditional American exuberance.

A cartoon in a recent *Saturday Review* has a worried-looking, mink-coated lady parading with a sign reading: "Would Someone Please Explain What's Going On". She will get no help from Walter Lipmann, dean of American journalists and assured analyst of domestic events and international affairs for two generations. "I know of nobody and I've heard of nobody," wrote Mr. Lipmann, "who has come anywhere near to understanding fully and practically this revolutionary condition." Sorting out the sources and components of the cultural crisis fall more properly within the scope of the social psychologist, although *Newsweek* invited six prominent historians, of differing political orientations, to offer their analyses and prognoses for its July 4th, Independence Day, issue. All would agree, however, that the two catalysts producing our present disarray are the war in Vietnam and the race question.

### *Neither Victory nor Defeat*

The attitude of the American people on the war is ambivalent. It wants to pay the price of neither victory nor

defeat in Vietnam. It wants to liquidate its involvement without seeming to have turned tail. It is significant that President Nixon's surprise announcement of the U.S. incursion into Cambodia was accompanied by jingoist reminders that the United States had never lost a war; and this from a man who is accelerating the removal of troops at a rate that dismays the military. Even the most energetic and uncompromising critics of the war in the U.S. Senate are careful to avoid in their language any semblance of a scuttle-and-run suggestion, preferring to speak of a political solution to be achieved at the Paris Conference where the North Vietnamese have been adamant on the withdrawal of all American troops as a basic condition of peace.

That the war could not be won militarily was clear in January 1968. It was not merely the evidence that the enemy in the Tet Offensive could strike simultaneously throughout the country, including an assault on the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, but the telling remark of an American major directing a counter-attack: "To save the town we had to destroy it". It was a town of 20,000 people. Destruction surpassing that wrought in Europe had not weakened the resistance of the enemy after 25 years of war. The reality of the carnage displayed each day on the TV began to dismay the American public, admission of futility of the effort gained wider acceptance.

### *The Economic Angle*

There was first a sense of the perversion of national priorities. The goals of John F. Kennedy's "New Frontier", the vision of a revitalised American society, were engulfed as the U.S. presence increased from 2,500 advisers in Vietnam to more than 500,000 troops a year and a half later. Apart from the 40,000 U.S. dead, the financial cost was clear in figures and in programmes sacrificed. Thirty billion dollars were added to the defence budget in the first two years of massive escalation (it is estimated that it cost \$350,000 to kill each Viet enemy), an expenditure which inevitably drove up prices. The increase was 1.7 per cent in 1965; it moved



to 3 per cent in 1966; it became 5.4 per cent last year; and has been moving upwards at an annual rate of almost 6.1 per cent this year, a process that has eroded the real value of pay cheques despite wage increases. Government borrowing to finance the war drove up interest rates, as did business seeking funds to invest in plant and equipment to keep up with an overheated economy. From 4.4 per cent in 1965, the interest rate has climbed to 9.3 per cent charged today to the homebuilder, the highest since the Civil War. The result is that housing is deteriorating faster than it is being replaced for a growing population. Stringent fiscal and monetary measures to cool off the economy have not merely boosted interest rates. They have brought on unemployment for over 5% of the work force and, in 18 months, a 36 per cent decline in the value of all shares on the New York Stock Exchange. Schools, hospitals and housing have not been built, the concerns of the poor have been shunted aside, major cities have deteriorated to the point of being ungovernable.

### *Disaffection of the Young*

A massive national disenchantment forced Lyndon B. Johnson to retire as a candidate in 1968 and elected as President—by a margin of seven-eighths of one per cent of the popular vote—Richard M. Nixon who claimed to have a plan to end the war. Vastly disappointed were the hundreds of thousands of young people who pinned their hopes on and broke their hearts for Senator Eugene McCarthy, the victim of the bosses at the Democratic Party Chicago Convention. Immensely more significant, in retrospect, was the disaffection of the young, the poor, and especially the Negro, who believed with a total trust that they had found understanding and a voice in Robert F. Kennedy, slain by a fanatic at the moment of his California triumph, which presaged a successful struggle for the Democratic nomination in Chicago and probably, eventual election as President.

For the mood of the American Negro has changed,

illustrating the sort of impatience noted in developing countries when progress is visible but deemed insufficient. A new militancy rejects the non-violent tactics of the Civil Rights movement of the '60s as well as its generation of leaders. In search of identity, it rejects integration for separatism and extols "Blackness" as a culture of its own, alien to the American heritage. In its more aggressive manifestations, such as the Black Panthers, black nationalism proclaims itself revolutionary, its members publicly carrying weapons to protect the black community against its enemies, the agents of a repressive colonialism, the police, always termed "the pigs". (There has been, indeed, a proliferation of self-announced revolutionary groups whose heroes are Che Guevara and Regis Debray. Their nihilistic programme of bombing the offices of international corporations in New York city has aggravated urban anxiety, with the Police Department Bomb Squad responding to 4,015 alarms in the first four months of this year: the 68 actual bombings culminated in an explosion which ripped through the second floor of the Police Headquarters, injuring seventeen persons.) But factionalism and unrelenting police harassment are turning the Black Panthers and other would-be urban guerrillas into suicidal revolutionaries, dedicated to augmenting the crisis of American society.

### *Nixon and the Negro*

Negroes have been elected mayors of large cities such as Cleveland and Newark, but the promise of full equality promised in the Fourteenth Amendment added to the federal Constitution more than a century ago is fatally far from implementation. The Report of the President's Committee on Civil Disorders, published more than two years ago, announced that the country was moving towards two societies, racially divided. That process, Negro leaders are persuaded, is being aggravated. The moderate chairman, Bishop Stephen G. Spottswood, of the moderate organization, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, won universal applause when, at the

organisation's annual Convention he indicted the Nixon Administration for a "calculated policy to work against the needs and aspirations of the largest minority of its citizens". The charge could be amply briefed. The Administration's policy is one of default, not prejudice against the Negro, but a studied cultivation of white Southern votes for the Republican Party. More extreme was the "Black Declaration of Independence" signed by a committee of Negro clergymen and published as a full-page advertisement in the *New York Times* just before Independence Day. In orotund language it paralleled the phrasing and form of the Declaration of 1776 and concluded that unless Negroes receive "full Redress and Relief" they will move to "renounce all Allegiance to this Nation . . ."

Demands by the Blacks for special attention—including reparations for the withheld wages of centuries of slavery—are strongly resented by the blue collar worker who is persuaded that everyone in America is being pampered except those whose skilled work and heavy taxes are keeping the country functioning. The chief current focus of the workers' irascibility is the dissent (and manner of dress) of college students, considered a luxury of an idle, irresponsible, privileged class. The action of thousands of construction workers in lower Manhattan, who descended to the streets to pummel mercilessly a parade of student war protesters on May 8th. was described by serious social critics as an outburst of inchoate Fascism and identified the protective helmet, "the hardhat", as a symbol of popular repression. But such polarisation is not confined to the lower middle class. A national survey, conducted in late May, listed campus unrest as the country's leading problem, ahead of the Vietnam War, racial strife, the high cost of life, crime and drug addiction.

### *Campus Unrest*

"Campus unrest" is an elaborately neutral term for the reaction that followed the President's April 30th announcement of the U.S. armed invasion of Cambodia and



the killing by National Guardsmen (the U.S. equivalent of Britain's Territorials) of four students on the campus of Kent State University, following days of looting in the city and the subsequent slaying of two Negro students by State Police in the girls' dormitory of Jackson State College in Mississippi. Some 750 campuses of higher education went on strike—against whom it is not clear—and, for all serious purposes, the academic year was finished. When polled, 82 per cent of a national sample of American people disagreed with the tactic “as a way to protest the way things are run in this country”.

An assessment of the revolt of American youth—its causes, depth, direction and significance—is another article for another time. Menacing is both the degree of its anger and its disbelief in the responsiveness of political institutions and the honesty of elders (the rumour was widely believed on college campuses that Nixon had resolved to call off the 1972 Presidential elections). The attitude is poignantly expressed in its calmer version in a recent letter from Lieut. Charles R. Saxbe, a Marine officer, to his father, a Republican Senator from Ohio, which was printed in the official *Congressional Record* on June 22nd. It read:

“I’m going to have to risk my life in Southeast Asia within the next year; risking my life in a war that has’nt been declared, can’t be fought and can’t be won; a war that is contrary to everything I’ve been taught to believe about America.

“For the last decade, Americans have been electing men who said that they had the solutions. You were one of those men. Going through the campaign, you and many others promised to go to Washington and see that the war was ended in as long as it would take to get the troops out.

“President Nixon pledged to put an end to the insanity and the war, fight inflation, promote continued social reform and bring us together. Promises have been compromised, the war has been expanded as it was in 1964 and 1968, the economy has gone to hell, racism

has been ignored and the duplicity of the Administration's words and actions have been ignored by the man in the White House.

"If the war doesn't end soon, I see an underground development that would seek to disrupt the country with arson, sabotage and assassination. The development is difficult to imagine but just stop to listen to the words of songs played on current radio programmes".

As a typical young American, Lieutenant Saxbe is unaware of the peril of a rightist reaction to what it considers fomented defeatism and a betrayal of American honour; nor does he complain about the absence of leadership in the Churches (since he never expected any). He wants instant solutions; he is, indeed, a representative of a growing group calling for "Parousia Now—or Else!"

### *A Polarized Society*

The "polarization" of American society is the common term of the social analyst today. While clear-cut opposition of groups can be identified — a significant one between the President and the Senate on the control of foreign policy being only one of the many we have no space here to examine—the malaise is so generalised that "disintegration" appears the more apposite word to describe the clash of values and interests and anti-values, and negations.

Perhaps we are in the process of learning the bitter truth the late Christopher Dawson expounded in a series of public lectures in our midst just ten years ago: "In the past our civilisation—and, indeed, every civilisation that is known to history—has recognised the existence of a moral order which is derived, not from conflicting individual interests or from the collective will of the State, but from a higher spiritual order. This great and ancient truth, as Edmund Burke wrote, is the ultimate foundation and no society which denies it or loses sight of it can endure". (*America and the Secularisation of Modern Culture*, Houston, Texas, 1960, p. 31.)

Writing on the 194th Independence Day, July 4, 1970, I am driven to the painful conclusion that America has lost sight of that great and ancient truth. This April the delegates of the Colorado Nurses' Association in their annual convention voted 173 to 109 (with 55 abstentions) in favour of euthanasia.

---

## *Hadamar Sanatorium*

The policy of the Nazis on compulsory euthanasia was introduced by Hitler in 1 September 1939 by a secret order. Altogether 275,000 died in the euthanasia centres. The officials of the Hadamar Sanatorium were tried on the grounds that no state can put a foreigner to death except after being proved guilty of an offence which carries the death penalty. Pope Pius XII alarmed by the reports of what was taking place in Germany said in 1943: "We deem it necessary to reiterate this grave statement today, when to our profound grief we see the bodily deformed, the insane and those suffering from hereditary disease at times deprived of their lives, as though they were a useless burden to society . . . what sane man does not recognise that this not only violates the natural and Divine Law written in the hearts of every man, but flies in the face of every sensibility of civilised humanity?"



# An Invitation

Dear Fellow Subscriber,

I am an executive recruiting consultant.<sup>(1)</sup> My job is seeking the leaders and managers my clients require to fill senior appointments in their organisations. It always gives my colleagues and myself particular satisfaction when we find a man who has been under-rated or under-employed and are able to watch him realise the full capacity we have assessed him to have and see him achieve success in a bigger and more suitable appointment.

In *Christian Order* you and I have made a find of another sort whose potential awaits full development. It is the most valuable reading I do every month: topical and interesting, fair and balanced, stimulating and encouraging. In my opinion it is, alas, by no means widely enough read and it is because I want to see it achieve its full potential that I have bought this space. *Christian Order* merits a circulation ten times its present size.

My idea is simple. I am convinced that every new reader will praise the magazine as much as we who subscribe to it. We have only to ensure that it is read by someone who does not know it to gain a new subscriber.

I am inviting you, therefore, to send £1 to the Editor for ten copies of the magazine. Then post or give a copy to ten friends or acquaintances adding a short hand-written request to become a subscriber. It will take an effort: for example, you will have to look for and buy suitable envelopes as well as write ten short letters. The effort, however, will make it a satisfying job of work, the result of which will be seen the following month.

I am certain it will be a success—in the case of my ten at least!

Please, will you join me in this small contribution to spreading *Christian Order*? And will you do it right away

(1) Mr. Reid is, in fact, Managing Director of the largest British firm in the senior executive recruiting field.—EDITOR.

because Father Crane has ordered the extra copies in anticipation of your acceptance.

May I thank you in advance for your co-operation and support. God bless you all.

Yours sincerely,  
J. M. Reid

---

## *A Slip in Definition*

"The idea of birth through a Holy Spirit, of the death of a Divine being, of the forgiveness of sins, or the fulfillment of prophecies, are ideas which, anyone can see, need but a touch to turn them into something blasphemous or ferocious. If some small mistake were made in doctrine, huge blunders might be made in human happiness. A sentence phrased wrong about the nature of symbolism might have broken all the best statues in Europe. A slip in definitions might stop all the dances; might wither all the Christmas trees or break all the Easter eggs. Doctrines had to be defined within strict limits, even in order that man might enjoy general human liberties. The Church had to be careful; if only that the world might be careless." Chesterton.

Sunday, October 25th, will be a very great day for the Catholic Church in England and Wales. It will see the canonisation of the Forty Martyrs; forty out of three hundred who died in defence of the supreme authority of the Holy See. What their example means now, not only for Catholics in this country, but everywhere is told by Father Philip Caraman, S.J. in the following article. A one-time Vice-Postulator of the Martyrs' Cause and noted historian of the Reformation scene in this country, he is well qualified to write with authority on a subject close to his heart.

# Lesson of the Forty Martyrs

PHILIP CARAMAN, S.J.

IT has become fashionable to criticise the present Pope in public, in group gatherings, and in private. The most common charge against him is pusillanimity or lack of firm and courageous leadership; and a contrast is frequently made with his predecessor, Pope John, who is said to have been a brave innovator. This is instant nonsense, but it is common enough. Of course, criticism is everyone's right and sometimes it is a duty, but uninformed criticism is only another symptom of the new adolescence that is afflicting the Church.

## *The Courage of Paul VI*

Courage was certainly needed on the part of Paul VI to proceed with the canonisation of the English and Welsh martyrs after the formal examinations had been completed in all their long-drawn-out stages from the reassumption of the Cause in 1959 to the papal fiat in May 1970. To me



it is significant that the objections to the canonisation, which Paul VI over-ruled, would almost certainly have prevented Pope John from proceeding with it had the preparations been complete in his pontificate. In 1962, when the late Cardinal Godfrey (to whom, incidentally, the canonisation owes so much) discussed the question with John XXIII, the old Pope shook his head in very grave doubt about its wisdom. He objected that it would rake up old scores. But he did not know what his successor appears to have known, that his misgivings went back nearly a hundred years, to the year 1872, when Cardinal Manning initiated the process of canonisation at a court specially summoned at Westminster. Manning had to give Pius IX the reassurance he demanded that a "cause like this" was not going to be displeasing "to the British Government and the Anglican clergy" and prove an obstacle to the advance of the Church in England. This was done. Then Pius IX raised a further objection: while "no such unfortunate consequences might occur in England, nevertheless perhaps it is possible that this cause of canonisation may provide a pretext for other European Governments and especially that of the new German Empire, which has launched a most hostile campaign against the Church, to attack the dogmatic definition of the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in matters of faith and morals . . . *seeing that these illustrious defenders of the faith paid the final penalty precisely because they strenuously defended the supreme primacy of Peter*". (italics mine). Pius IX was again reassured and, in the autumn of 1872, the work was begun which will reach its culmination in the ceremonies of October 25th this year.

### *Groundless Fears*

In recent years similar apprehensions, this time that the canonisation would be a set-back for the ecumenical movement in England, were expressed on many sides and in high places. Paul VI ignored these fears. That he was right has been abundantly proved by the correspondence that took place in *The Times* last December and January

and still more by the declaration of the British Council of Churches when it met shortly before Christmas at St. Edward's House, Westminster. The Canonisation, it stated, was something from which all Christians might draw strength regardless of their denominational allegiance. It was signed by representatives of all Churches and all Christian communities in the British Isles.

The same statement also acknowledged that the Catholic Church in England and Wales owed its continued existence to its martyrs; and this was something for which all Churches should be grateful. Indeed, while it is certain that if England had not been converted by St. Augustine and Ireland by St. Patrick, others would have done the job, it is even more certain that if the martyrs had not risked everything—homes, families, possessions, their lives — to preserve the Catholic Church, none would have done. In this sense they achieved more than the first apostle of England and therefore it is fitting that they should stand with him as patrons of their country. It is no argument to point out that the great increase in the numbers of Catholics in the 19th and 20th centuries has been due chiefly to Irish immigration; the point is that, thanks to the Martyrs, a Church existed in England and Wales into which they could be absorbed. There is the example of Sweden to illustrate how it takes less than a generation for a large immigrant population to be lost totally to the Faith in parts of the country where the Church does not exist even in a skeleton framework.

### *The Martyrs and the Holy See*

But the important thing about the canonisation is this. It is timely and even urgent. The Martyrs' example is just what the Church needs today. All of them (only forty among over three hundred are now being canonised) were executed because they refused to deny the supreme authority of the Holy See. This was the real issue no matter what trumped up charge formed the indictment. St. Thomas More expressed their common cause most pithily

when he said on the scaffold that he died the King's good servant, but God's first. There was hardly a martyr after him who did not protest that he died a loyal Englishman. All saw clearly that the Papacy with its shortcomings, even scandals, was essential to the preservation of the Church and to the unity of Christendom. St. Thomas More had concluded this very early in his first controversial work, the *Dialogue against Luther*. He wrote: "I am moved to obedient submission to this See by all those arguments which learned and holy men have assembled in support of this point. Moreover, I am indeed moved not least by a fact which I have so often noted; that not only has no one been hostile to the Christian faith without at the same time declaring war on that See, but also there has never been anyone who declared himself an enemy of that See without shortly afterwards declaring himself also a notorious and foremost enemy and traitor both to Christ and to our religion".

To Thomas More's stand we owe everything that is characteristic in English Catholicism. It was his example that influenced the Catholic Bench of Bishops who, with one exception, stood firm on the accession of Elizabeth I and died in prison rather than admit her ecclesiastical supremacy; and through the Bishops the example came down to the Elizabethan and later Martyrs. In Ireland, while he was thinking his way into the Church and preparing himself for the sacrifices submission involved, Edmund Campion was inspired by Thomas More's example. This is clear from his reference to More as "that great and saintly Englishman" in his preface to his uncompleted *History of Ireland*. To take only one other example, the Welsh schoolmaster and poet, Richard Lwynn, whose emphasis on papal supremacy must be made to stand for them all. Under examination on the point he said: "A man is bound to love God above all things and his neighbour as himself; and I place the Queen under the highest degree of neighbourhod contained in the commandment, Honour thy father and mother; but I will not make her my God".



## *Lesson for Today*

Fidelity to the Holy See for which the Martyrs suffered was more exacting then than it can possibly be today. After all, the issue was blurred at times by the far from exemplary personal lives of the Popes, and even worse, saintly Popes like Pius V could test Catholic loyalty to its utmost. His wisdom in declaring Elizabeth I a bastard, excommunicating her and releasing her subjects from their allegiance has always been questioned by historians, as it was questioned by Catholics at the time. It could not have put them in a more cruel dilemma. To have their loyalty compromised in this way when their country was threatened by invasion was the last sacrifice they wanted to make for their faith. Yet they made it.

Today, in different circumstances and in different ways, sacrifices are being asked of Catholics by the same See for which the Martyrs died. The Martyrs' task now is to make it as clear to us as it was to them that allegiance to the Papacy is the only bond of unity within the Church and indeed the ultimate bond of unity among all Christians. If this is broken or weakened, then the Church suffers schism or at least, is threatened by it. As one Elizabethan sufferer said: "In the keys given to Peter and in the exercising of the same consisteth all authority ecclesiastical given by God unto any man". This is the lesson of the Martyrs not only for England, but for all countries where the Church is found today.

---

The mounting Sino-Soviet crisis has barely been mentioned in England. With the deployment of nuclear rocket batteries at strategic points along the common frontier it is clear that Russia has considered the possibility of a nuclear pre-emptive strike against the Chinese. Underlying the ideologies is a basic problem which, America, with the help of its allies, could solve. The alternative is too terrible to contemplate.

## Sino-Soviet Crisis

E. L. WAY

I MAKE no apology for returning to the possibility of a Sino-Soviet war. The military preparations have rapidly gone ahead, the danger has vastly increased since I last wrote in *Christian Order* in May 1969. The American experts used to say that it would be time enough to be overly concerned with such an eventuality when the Soviet divisions on the Chinese frontier numbered more than thirty. During this summer the estimated number of divisions mustered along the frontier has reached thirty-five and, with an airlift, could within weeks reach sixty.

### *Scaleboard and Frog*

Much more ominous is the strategic placing by the Russians of many hundreds of tactical nuclear rockets on the border. And included amongst these missiles is the new mobile solid-fuel one known to the American analysts as Scaleboard. It is mounted on a tank chassis, has a warhead which weighs more than a megaton, and can be exploded over a target 500 miles away. The object of the Scaleboards is to destroy China's nuclear capability. Although the time factor cannot be guessed, and may not even exist, being

determined by the situation in the Far East, it is obvious that a pre-emptive nuclear strike against the Chinese must be seriously considered as a fearful possibility. And not only have the Scaleboards been deployed for the first time on this frontier but the Russians have added a fourth company to each of their Frog battalions in the Far East. (The Frog is a nuclear rocket with a range of thirty miles. In Europe the Frog battalions have only three companies.)

On the Chinese side a missile testing complex has been built near Peking from which a two-stage liquid fuel rocket will be tested soon on a target area in the western Sinkiang province about 2,000 miles away. It was a version of this rocket that launched the Chinese satellite, *Chicom I*, into orbit earlier this year. The satellite weighed 380 pounds, and it is suggested by some experts that in an emergency half-a-dozen such missiles could be fired from the new site as well as from older launch pads in the vicinity of Lop Nor. China has also moved up several thousand regular troops to positions nearer their lightly armed border units; and these border units are now better armed and trained than they were a year ago. Indeed the entire northern frontier has been strengthened so that there are now more than 2,000,000 men ready for the emergency.

Though the actual fighting has died down, and both countries have for a year now studiously avoided any action that could lead to a major clash, the Russian build-up has long since past any purely defensive measures, and shows no signs of slacking. (The latest sign of trouble, at the time of writing, is that the Soviets have declared their intention to settle an island in the river near their city of Khabarovsk — about a 100 miles from Damansky island where on Sunday, 2 March 1969, a bloody battle took place.)

### *The Bonn Pact*

The Bonn Pact, signed on 12 August 1970, between the West Germans and the Russians in the Great Kremlin Palace takes on a different significance if looked at in the light of the tension in the Far East. West German officials are con-

vinced that Russian economic difficulties created the desire in the Soviets for a political pact with Bonn. The Germans believe that the pact will lead to further trade negotiations between the two countries. But if you look at the key points in the treaty you will see that the stress is not on trade but on resolving conflicts by peaceful means: respecting the territorial integrity of all European states, regarding as inviolate all European frontiers, including the Oder-Neisse Line as Poland's frontier — and the border between East and West Germany. The Germans may want trade, but it is abundantly clear that what the Russians want is peace in Europe. *They do not want a war on two fronts.* Added strength is lent to this argument if it is remembered that the last Soviet-West German trade pact expired in 1963 and, despite West German prompting, Moscow showed not the least desire to renew it. It was not until 1969 — the year of the great armed clashes between China and Russia — that the Russians began to try to improve relations with West Germany. And Germany is only part of the picture, the Russians are doing their utmost to improve their standing in Western Europe.

### *Czech Liberalism*

The brutal suppression of Czech liberalism in 1968 revealed not a reversal of post-Stalin policies but a very genuine fear that the whole system of defensive alliances in the west might break down. (I said so at the time when every commentator that I read saw in it nothing but the digging up of the corpse of Stalin.) If the Czechs could speak out and publish freely and go on to expel communism from their country at the polling booth, would not other Eastern European countries follow suit? And once the Czechs had successfully established these fundamental liberties for how long could they be withheld from the Russians? The tapes smuggled out of the concentration camps of Russia conveying messages from Alexander Ginsburg, Vladimir Bukovsky, Andrei Amalrik and Josef Kazakov, and broadcast in July over the Columbia Broadcasting System, demonstrate clearly



that as Andrei Amalrik said in his statement: "some people at all events begin to have the idea that all these local smaller problems have their origins in the imperfections of the political system under which we live." He continued, "What may lead to revolution is the utter lack of good sense in the upper class, which is always trying to resist change." (His complaint has validity outside the communist world.) But with the Russians facing the greatest peril which any nation could possibly face: a devastating war with the Chinese, it is obvious even to purblind fanatics that the first casualties would be Czech and Russian liberalism. Just suppose, for example, that the US and Canadian border was lined with Scaleboards and Frog nuclear rocket battalions, and that on either side there were some 2,000,000 troops poised for attack, and then go on to ask yourself how much liberalism or democracy would survive in either country.

### *American Power Shrinking*

And at this critical juncture in the world's affairs, the Americans are beset by fearful internal strains, and are slowly being inched out of three danger areas: Europe, the Middle East, and South East Asia. The Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean has now shrunk to two carriers with their aircraft, and that historic sea is rapidly becoming a Soviet lake. The Russian navy has besides its larger elements the use of Alexandria and probably Latakia in Syria as airbases, not to mention its use of the Algerian base of Mers el Kebir. Russian money is also being poured into Malta with the hope of one day seeing a pro-Soviet government in that island. (What a pity it is that we in the West always back Sheiks, military juntas, and oppressors of the poor in all the seats of power. It is as if all Europe had risen in indignation at the Armenians when the Turks were butchering them in large numbers.)

The British, it was said, had lost an Empire and had not found a role. America in the 25 years since the end of the Second World War is fast losing its role without ever having possessed anything but a dollar empire. And as long as

Russia is looked upon as a dangerous enemy bent upon making the world safe for communism — instead of seeing that she is much more bent upon surviving a massive Chinese onslaught — the world will continue to drift rudderless to its destruction. For those who view an ultimate Sino-Soviet war as a boon to the non-communist world forget that the fallout from the 'dirty' bombs will be carried all over the world but especially by the prevailing winds to the north American continent.

### *Food*

Underlying the putrescent ideologies both capitalist and communist, and the wars and revolutions they cause to fester, is the problem of food and population. With a greater part of China and Asia on the edge of starvation, both Western Europe and America are drowning in crop surpluses: the U.S. Department of Agriculture has 225 million bushels of wheat lying idle, and the six Common Market nations cannot dispose of their surpluses of butter and corn, soya beans, sugar, animal feeds and cotton. No peace will endure for any length of time if China cannot get the food it needs, and China nearly always 'exists on the precipice of food disaster'. If China cannot get the food we cannot throw away, China will fight. It is as simple as that. And the Chinese threat is formidable: it is not a strike of dockers or a campus riot we shall be dealing with.

The U.S. assisted by Australia, Canada, New Zealand and Russia must create a world food pool upon which the starving nations can draw, not as a matter of charity but as a matter of right. This programme would cost money. (The coming war will cost us our civilisation.) American and Canadian farmers will have to be paid. "But a two-piece system with the U.S. government subsidising, in part, the programme for production for the world food pool would meet this need. Food-deficit states like China would not obtain food free of charge. They could pay their share, although not the full cost. Coupled with programmes to increase China's foreign exchange earnings, the programme could be

financed within the bounds of present U.S. budget projections merely by diversion of fractions of the sums being spent on armaments ("*The Coming War between Russia and China*", by Harrison E. Salisbury, Pan Special, p. 221).

We have a choice: pulling down our barns, and building greater, and there bestowing all our fruits to rot, while we eat, drink, and be merry, or setting up a world food pool.

---

## *Fresh Sino-Soviet Rivalry*

Since the above article was written, it has been reported in *Aviation Week* magazine that the Chinese might test their first intercontinental ballistic missile in 1971. Presumably it would be launched from one of the test sites near Lop Nor (Singkiang Province) and would land in the Indian Ocean. The Russians and the Indian defence minister have both reported increasing Chinese naval activity in that ocean; and Chinese technicians are setting up a tracking and monitoring station in Zanzibar. Meanwhile Soviet marines were put ashore on the island of Socotra from a 4,000-ton Alligator-class landing ship. They will guard a radio station being built on the island. The Russians have also acquired fishing rights in Mauritius, and recently were seeking facilities there for naval bunkering. The main US space-tracking station in this area is in Asmara, capital of Eritrea. An Arab and Chinese supported Eritrean Liberation Front is engaged with the Ethiopian army there. So far the base has not been threatened. E. L. W.

## CURRENT COMMENT

Father Paul Crane finds the genesis of our present discontents in the social effects of the Protestant Ethic, which gave capitalism free rein and smashed the lives of the poor; and the philosophy of the French Enlightenment, which made men, not God, the arbiter of public life. Out of this has come the constrictive society of contemporary Britain, which degrades human dignity in the interests of fake justice. Hope is found in the present frustrations of the young, which proceed from their sensed inadequacy of the substance of present society to meet the the claims of dignity. For Christians, the path of wisdom lies in recognition of this major sign of the times.

# Present Discontents: Genesis and Hope

THE EDITOR

**I**F ASKED, I would describe the lives of people in this country today as dominated by the prospect of cumulative material progress, whilst beset at the same time with a sense of insecurity that is both cause and effect of growing moral disintegration. At the back of this somewhat paradoxical mood is an outlook that characterises contemporary English society now as never before. I would call it "this-worldliness". It is what one might expect to find in a people that has long since lost sight of God and become accustomed, in consequence, to evaluate its existence almost solely in material terms.



## *Christianity and Progress*

The implication is somewhat startling. Am I saying that Christianity is incompatible with material progress; that the abandonment of moral standards, which are in the guardianship of the Catholic Church, is closely connected with the kind of rapid industrial and scientific advance that characterises English life today? I think a qualification is needed. Christianity is incompatible, certainly, with *unprincipled* progress, of the sort that goes ahead without reference to the claims of human dignity as a first charge on any kind of material advance. I would add that past progress appears to me to have been mainly of this unprincipled sort; made, that is, without reference to the paramount claims of personality, respect for which is a first charge on any kind of industrial, social or scientific endeavour. It profits a man nothing, we have been told, if he gains the whole world and loses his soul. We appear to live in a society in which the reverse is increasingly true. In England today, a man is thought foolish if he retains his integrity at the price of material advantage. This is the measure of our present degradation and the reason, at base, for our discontent.

It will be worthwhile, perhaps, to look very briefly at the process whereby the claims of human beings—to be responsible, under God, for their own lives—have been pushed aside; made subservient to the domination of those for whom material progress has been an end in itself, something to be sought, that is, for its own sake and regardless of all other considerations. The object is to indicate, however briefly, the genesis of today's society, wedded to the ideal of cumulative material progress and beset, at the same time, by the kind of insecurity which is both cause and effect of growing moral disintegration.

## *The Protestant Ethic*

For a beginning we have to take a look at the Protestant Reformation and its connection, in this country and elsewhere, with that vast upsurge of unprincipled energy which we call the Industrial Revolution. The real question is not

*how* the Industrial Revolution happened; but *why* it happened when it did. In effect, its first beginnings represented little more than the harnessing of known contraptions and devices to the first primitive processes of industrial output. There is little mystery here. Simple mechanical contraptions existed in plenty in what might be called Mediaeval England. The point to notice is that they were not used in the service of industrial production. The reason is that there was no acquisitive drive behind their mediaeval employment, which remained largely for purposes that were aesthetic and pleasurable. In pre-Reformation England, acquisitiveness broke out from time to time, but society in general remained restrained in its wealth-getting by Christian principle, controlled by a social morality which bade men seek first the justice of the Kingdom of God. Whatever the defects of English society before the Reformation, it never elevated acquisitiveness to the point where it stood in its own right as an unquestioned and lawful instinct to be followed to the point where unrestrained wealth-getting became an absolute good in itself. For this we have to look to what Max Weber has called the Protestant Ethic, which proceeded from the splitting of the moral authority of the Church at the time of the Reformation and the enthronement of the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone. With good works no longer of significant account, wealth-getting was sanctioned as an outward sign of inner godliness; a new secular sacrament in whose service acquisitiveness was set free of constraint. The overthrow of Catholic dogma by Protestant England was followed quickly enough and inevitably by the shattering of what had been the country's social conscience. The way was opened to the establishment of unbridled profit-making as the guiding principle of economic and social life. Industriousness was all, poverty no more than the fruit of sin. So the first Elizabeth provided for the whipping of "sturdy beggars" and later governments for the penal conditions of workhouse life. The call was a far one to the time, not long before, in pre-Reformation England, when the monasteries,

whatever their failings, saw their duty to the poor as that of receiving those who claimed a share of their bounty in the name of Christ. This went as acquisitiveness gained the day, to be given final justification by Adam Smith in his *Wealth of Nations* and the Victorian popularist moralisers and economists who clustered in the great man's train. Above all, there was the justification seemingly provided by the industrial build-up and growing wealth of England herself. Her prosperity bore witness to her godliness or so it seemed to the somewhat self-righteous Victorians. The trouble is that they never looked long and hard below the surface. Had they done so, they would have seen what Frederick Ozanam, Founder of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, saw in London when on a visit to the Great Exhibition in 1851. He was staggered by the contrast between the wealth produced by England's roaring industrialism and the beggars who came pouring out of the side streets running off the Strand to beg for bread at his carriage window.

### *The Smashing of the Poor*

What Ozanam saw in London was not untypical of Britain as a whole. The Victorians who saw it were not shocked by it because totally influenced in their social thinking by the Protestant Ethic, which saw poverty as the fruit of ungodliness, and the popularised version of *laissez-faire*, which forbade interference with acquisitiveness on the ground that, if each sought the utmost profit for himself, the "invisible hand" would get to work to make all come out for the best in the best of all possible worlds. In the long run all would come right. A hundred years on — in the wake of the Great Depression — John Maynard Keynes produced the answer to that one. "In the long run", he wrote, "we are all dead". But the Victorians did not see it this way. The most they felt they should do for the poor was to send them to Bible Class and set them to work. Meanwhile, any qualms they might have had were quashed by Darwin and the extended, popular versions of

his theory of natural selection, which only served to justify still further their earlier enthronement of unrestricted profit-making as the guiding principle of economic life. The poor, meanwhile, continued to be smashed and their dignity set at a discount in a Victorian England made complacent by its huge and increasing pile-up of material wealth.

### *Voiceless Churches*

During the whole of this time, the Catholic Church in England was without voice because destroyed in substance at the Reformation, its numbers minimised, its members hanging on as a remnant and nothing more. The Anglican Church had been established and remained as a kept thing, without significant influence on the structure of English society because the prisoner of the forces which made the very society of which, by the eighteenth century, it had become no more than a built-in part. True, there were noble voices in protest against injustice, but the Anglican Church as a whole went with the tide. It offers, perhaps, an extreme example of the way in which the Churches, Catholic as well as Protestant, were pressurised by the new Nationalism that followed the break-up of Christendom, first into partnership, then junior partnership with the new Nation States; then led, inevitably if subconsciously, into acquiescence with an order of society marked almost universally by the kind of this-worldliness which gave first place within society to the claims of material progress and established wealth without regard for the dignity of the poor. The back-to-back slum houses of Lancashire's industrial towns, the Glasgow closes where the famine-Irish lived were matched by the barradas of Lima where the poor still live on rubbish tips and the appalling shanty towns of Rio de Janeiro and Caracas where the dispossessed are driven even today to scavenge like animals for a living. It is typical of Anglo-Saxon Protestantism that it should point to the latter as indicative of the Catholic Church's incompatibility with progress, whilst turning a blind eye to its own industrial back yard. What toffee-nosed Protestant



observers failed and still fail to see is that each situation is bad and attributable, at base, to the same cause — the confinement of religious influence within bounds made steadily smaller by the overweening secular ambitions of the Nation State.

### *Enlightenment and Sovereign Reason*

There were other forces, too, which reinforced the compassionless trend bred by the Protestant Ethic. Once doctrine is disrupted belief in God begins to grow weak. The philosophy of the Enlightenment, which erupted in the French Revolution, enthroned reason in God's place as sovereign and made man's intellect the measure of all things. Objective truth and morality went, in consequence, and, with their going, there came very naturally, to the countries of the mainland of Europe, the exclusion of religion from education and public life. There was no room in the class room and university hall for the "superstition" the newly installed official and teaching class considered religion to be. There its sole effect, they said, would be to cloud the untrammelled process of sovereign minds. Similarly, in public life, men and governments should order their dealings with each other through rational channels freed from religious superstition: for all this could do would be to clutter the free flow of rational communication between them. This, in crude outline, is the philosophy which was carried through Europe on the tips of the bayonets of Napoleon's soldiers. Wherever it was carried, it bred an official class which confined the Church to the sacristy, made her a thing of women only and banished her from public life. For the adherents of this philosophy, who dominated the public life of Europe until the close of the Second World War, even in Catholic countries, freedom became no more than an end in itself, divorced from allegiance to objective truth; which meant that choice was all, truth what you made it and secular education the key to the world's progress.

Of these strands was European liberalism woven and,

with it, the dawnist social philosophy, which believed in man's power to build without God a brave new world in the image of himself. Social optimism was the order of the day, especially among the new bourgeoisie whose position and power were bettered by the *laissez-faire* doctrine which sovereign reason declared essential to that economic progress which brought them wealth in the short run and, in the long, the blessing of bettered material standards to all their countrymen.

### *Sovereign Will and Democratic Totalism*

But there was another strand—this time political—which flowed from the philosophy of the Enlightenment to bring consequences which are still working themselves out amongst us today, still actively shaping the society in which we live. The atheistic thinking which made reason sovereign made the people, not God, the ultimate repository of political power. The sovereign intellect took political issue in a sovereign will of which the ruler was incarnate expression. It followed that he, too, was sovereign; the more so when his position rested on a franchise extended to the point of universal suffrage. Thus were the first beginnings of totalitarian democracy born. The litmus was here that was to transform liberal democracy into the democratic socialism that is with us today and moving already into the kind of State omnicompetence that is the inevitable counterpart of growing democratic totalism.

### *Fabian Socialism and State Constriction*

There are two further strands to this kind of growth and each is worth brief examination. In the first place and very obviously, if the sovereign ruler is to express the sovereign will of a sovereign people, there must be no barriers between him and the people themselves. The channels must be kept open and this means ultimately the end of voluntary associations within society itself. It is a matter not merely of keeping the Church in the sacristy so that communication (between ruler and ruled) may not

be muddled with the kind of religious "superstition" that makes reason falter. Voluntary associations also have to go so that the allegiance of citizens may not be split, but remain tied to him who is the popular incarnation of the people's will. Already, the shadow of Big Brother is creeping across the popular horizon, liberal democracy sliding into Democratic Socialism with its concept of State omniscience — the sovereign ruler using his sovereign power at the behest of the sovereign popular will to promote the material advantage of the sovereign people. Out of such thinking — or something very close to it — was Fabian Socialism born. Now, the popular ruler was no longer negatively to maintain conditions in public life that allowed popular choice free play; keeping the ring, so to say, whilst the strong came out on top and the weak went to the wall. Precisely because it got no further than this *laissez-faire* went out as a too eventual leveller. As the sovereign ruler became more sovereign with the extension of the franchise, liberal democracy began to demand that he act *on behalf of* the mass of the people to whom he owed his sovereign power. The task of the ruler now was no longer that of allowing the free choice of the few to run eventually to the material advantage of the (newly enfranchised) many. The ruler was seen now as the sovereign channel through which alone the free choice of the many could be made to work in their sovereign interests. Choice was no longer an end in itself. Material advantage was. As the poor attained political power one can hardly blame their eagerness to exchange the constrictions which unbridled capitalism brought with the poverty it thrust into their lives, for the generally constricted existence State regulation brings to the lives of everyone in this country—rich and poor—today. At least, the poor would argue, they have more now than their fathers had then. This is certainly true. There is a picture in one of the volumes of Harold MacMillan's biography. It shows him in the thirties with families in his constituency of Stockton-on-Tees. I looked at it the other day and was horrified.

## *Bitter Exchange*

Yet the tragedy remains. It is to be found not in the spread of improved material standards throughout the community of Britain, but in the fact that they have become for so many of every class in this country the be-all and end-all of existence—to the point, indeed, where people in general appear prepared increasingly to bear almost unlimited government imposition provided, thereby, they can have more of this world's goods. History reveals a bitter exchange. The this-worldliness which smashed the poor in the interests of private profit has given way under Democratic Socialism, as we may call it, to the this-worldliness which makes State prisoners of rich and poor alike for the sake of material advantage. In either case, the claims of dignity go by default. Under liberal capitalism, the poor were denied opportunity to take responsibility for their own lives because of the poverty which the new industrialism thrust upon them. Under democratic Socialism it is being exchanged for higher living standards. The kind of responsible living, which human dignity demands, is impossible without a sufficiency. It is obviously and equally impossible when signed away in exchange for it. Man has a right to a sufficiency in order that he may be free to make his own way forward under God. There is neither point nor morality in a system which gives him a sufficiency at the price of constricting further the very freedom of action it is meant to sustain. This is the irony of contemporary society as I see it in Britain today. There has been an exchange, but no basic change, no shift in favour of dignity; only a secular procession which has converted the individual from a pawn of unbridled capitalism into a unit constricted within the design of growing State omnicompetence.

## *Equalitarian Trend*

Two strands have been set within the constricted society of contemporary Britain by the liberal materialism that gave it birth. It has been shaped without God to



promote the material interests of a supposedly sovereign people. In the process, the substance which unites men — the dignity they share because made in the image of God — has been lost sight of. Concentration, therefore, has been on the accidentals that divide. The drive has been to eliminate these in the interests of imposed uniformity, which is—and must be—the materialists' substitute for Christian ideal of responsible unity under God. Variety flowers amongst men when dignity is held high and becomes, thereby, the substance of their unity. Once dignity goes, uniformity is substituted for unity and variety crushed in its interests. Drabness becomes the order of the day. Hence the egalitarian outlook, which is gaining ground fast in Britain now, and whose aim is to reduce all to a like anonymity in the interests of a fake equalitarianism. The instruments are obvious—State welfare which flattens out differences in the sameness of the out-patients' queue, comprehensive education which substitutes mass schooling for selective scholarship, savagely progressive taxation, the downgrading of the hereditary principle, the upgrading of folk heroes and so on, and so on. Through these and other measures the politics of envy works for a society in contemporary Britain where no one shall be thought of as having the right to be better than anyone else except by virtue of the sovereign people. Pop stars are allowed their moments of glory precisely because they are popular images, owing their all to the people who have made them and who can destroy them, who have put them up and can pull them down. Meritocrats are tolerated because they serve the people, managing the People's State. Footballers, also, because they entertain the people and are great only so long as they entertain. Let them cease to do this; let them no longer entertain, and they are out. It is the same with so many others. These are the new aristocrats of the People's State. It is, therefore, no coincidence and should give no surprise that, increasingly, they graced Prime Minister Wilson's parties at Downing Street. And, incidentally, the newspapers' view of Aningoni's new

portrait of the Queen was deprecatory precisely because she was depicted not as a folk image, but in her own splendid right as a ruling sovereign, rightfully unwilling to be turned into a cheap image of the time.

### *Any Limits to Envy?*

And where will envy stop? Only, I think, when it has reduced all to a common flatness, for the materialism which makes it contains within itself no inherent principle able to curtail the extent of intensity of its impact. And, indeed, the extending impact of envy on British society will be assisted by a second strand built into the constricted society and bound to make cumulative its effect on the capacity of the individual citizen to assume in his own living the degree of responsibility called for by his dignity as a human being. The process is simple and very obvious. The more you do for an individual the less he is inclined to do for himself; and the whole *raison d'être* of the constricted society in which we live, particularly in its welfare aspect, is that the government should do things for the individual citizen as distinct from encouraging him to do things for himself. As a result of its ministrations, therefore, he becomes less and less inclined to do things for himself. Wherefore, it seems more and more obvious to the materialistically-minded humanitarians in control of this country's government machine that more and more should be done by government for a citizenry made increasingly incapable of doing anything for itself as a result of government's original ministrations. The constricted society built by materialists in defiance of dignity carries within itself the seeds of a cumulative progression away from dignity's claims.

### *Gleam of Hope*

The picture is dark, but not necessarily as dark as it seems. There is a gleam of light at the end of the tunnel. It is very faint, but it is there. It comes in this fashion.

Man does not live by bread alone. The constrictive

society believes that he does. It proceeds on this principle — cumulatively in disregard of dignity. Not all acquiesce with this kind of fake progress. There is frustration within the constricted society of England today. The contemporary revolt against authority, though muddle-headed and totally jejune in many ways, is best seen, perhaps, as an outward expression of the frustration a certain number are feeling. The same applies to the overturning of accepted social conventions. Within the area of freedom still left to them in their private lives, some are endeavouring to express their individuality in defiance of contemporary constrictive trends. This applies particularly to the young; which is natural enough. I have no desire to idealise their activities, merely to note that underlying a fair number of them it is possible to detect a striving for individual recognition which, despite its often sordid expression, bears witness, in the last analysis, to dignity's claims. Not that the young know what dignity is; neither can they be expected to know, for they have inherited the godlessness of their fathers, and dignity is found in likeness to God. But they do want to be somebody and this means, for many of them, getting out of the social queue where all must remain anonymous, and making something of their lives. This is the reality that underlies a good deal of contemporary craziness. On top, the outward expression of inner frustration is often sordid, and must be, for the young today are without knowledge of God and His Law; without realisation, in consequence, that they can only find themselves and each other in Him. Consequently, we should not be surprised that their private world is one of moral extravagance and excess. What counts, perhaps, is not so much this, but the striving to realise something in themselves that underlies the moral extravagance. It is on this that discerning Christians should fasten. In this that they should find hope, remembering that the great Augustine went through the same process before he, too, came to his God. Why not the kids of today? If only we would take them right, realising how much we have to give them and how much, without knowing it perhaps, they want what we Catholics have.

# Earthly Things

FRANCIS FENN, S.J.

WE may smile at hymns like "O Mother I could weep for mirth", but what do we make of the prayer that comes several times in the Roman Missal that we may "learn to despise earthly things and love those of heaven" — even though in a modern Sunday missal *despite* becomes *set no store by*? It is a good rule not to pray prayers that we do not mean, which indeed would be hypocrisy. Do we really want to learn to set no store by the things of earth, the human things we have learned to love; and what are the things of heaven which anyhow we cannot see or know:

"the things that no eye has seen and no ear has heard, things beyond the mind of man, all that God has prepared for those who love him." (1)

This is by no means an imaginary problem. For most of us, it is unlikely that we might adopt a "pie in the sky" viewpoint — to compensate us for the miseries of this world. The danger for modern Christians rather is that:

"in their fascination by a future which demands for its building all their vitality, people can no longer face the changing of human hopefulness into the virtue of hope, so that the whole of Christian eschatology is degraded into one vast Utopianism." (2)

We begin by referring to a passage in St. John on which we commented in our article in August. After the feeding of the five thousand, the crowds were looking for Jesus, "because you had all the bread you wanted to eat. Do not work for food that cannot last, but work for food that endures to eternal life." There is here that almost violent contrast with which readers of the Gospels will be familiar; but Jesus is not telling his hearers to be idle. The well-known passage

(1) I Corinthians 2, 9. (2) H. de Lubac: *The Splendour of the Church*, p. 44

n St. Matthew lights up his attitude to work:

"Do not be anxious about your life, what you shall eat or what you shall drink . . . Look at the birds of the air; they neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them." (3)

Anxious care is not to be admitted; the word means more than simple thought or planning. Jesus refers to the kind of worry that leads to a divided loyalty and ultimately to an exclusive concentration on possessions. He proposes the example of the birds; but few men work as hard for their food as the average sparrow. (4)

Before passing from the discourse on the Bread of Life (John 6) it is worth noting that a similar confrontation took place, two chapters earlier, with the woman of Samaria at the well:

"Jesus said to her, Every one who drinks of this water will thirst again, but whoever drinks of the water that I shall give him will never thirst; the water that I shall give him will become in him a spring of water welling up to eternal life. The woman said to him, Sir, give me this water, that I may not thirst, nor come here to draw."

Like the crowds who were only interested in free bread, the woman does not (yet) understand what Jesus is trying to tell her. But we notice from these two incidents that there is at least a correspondence between the things of earth and those of heaven: ordinary bread and water point to heavenly realities — they are, as we should say, sacramental. Moreover for St. John, as for every Christian, the heavenly reality begins on earth. There is no unbridgeable gap between the two.

This, indeed, is what we should expect. The world, and our life in it, is God's creation and already a sign of his love. At the beginning man was invited to co-operate with God: "fill the earth and subdue it". (5) We do not (or should not) just take all this for granted and look for salvation and ful-

(3) Matthew 6, 25-26. (4) Jerome Biblical Commentary, 43:47.

(5) Genesis 1, 28.



filment to come from somewhere *outside* the created order, as if heaven were "up there". We are familiar with the Advent theme: Let the earth open, that salvation may sprout forth. (6) In the fullness of time, Jesus is born of a virgin. Earthly things become the vehicle of heavenly life, as the prayers at the offertory at Mass remind us:

"Blessed are you, Lord, God of all creation. Through your goodness we have this bread to offer, which earth has given and human hands have made. It will become for us the bread of life."

But there is, very definitely, a transformation here. Ordinary bread becomes the Bread of Life. It is in virtue of this same Bread that "we await the Lord Jesus Christ, and he will transfigure these lowly bodies of ours into copies of his glorious body" (7) This would seem to apply to those who are still alive at the Second Coming, but in I Corinthians St. Paul shows from nature that the death of a seed is not an obstacle, but the condition of its passage to a higher and richer life. God can provide glorified man with a body suited to his glorious state. (8)

St. Paul was probably writing in view of Jewish ideas of the risen life similar to materialistic Mohammedan teachings about Paradise. Such views, indeed, are by no means absent today, and it is not only Spiritualists who have a very earthy idea of heaven,

"as if one had to believe in the eternal permanence of animal functions and pleasures in order to make sure of believing in the resurrection of the body — indeed, as if liberation from subjections of this kind, involved as they are with the weakness and corruption of our mortal flesh, were not, precisely, the glory of this bodily resurrection. Sometimes it seems as if these things are held on to as one of the privileges of the beatific life of the resurrection body; people want to take the imagery of the heavenly banquet (9) literally, as if such things did not come high on the list of the earthly

(6) Isaiah 45, 8; cf. P. Coughlan, *The New Mass*, p. 86.

(7) Philippians 3, 21. (8) I Cor. 15, 35 ff.

(9) Luke 14, 15; 22, 30.

things the power to despise which we ask constantly of God, and as if the table of the Kingdom of Heaven ought not to wipe out our memories of all earthly food. Yet people bring themselves to believe that we should not be able to come by that perfect knowledge of the universe which is to delight the elect if taste were not materially present to our sense in the act of eating." (10)

It is, of course, Christ who gives the key to the problem we have been considering. He shared our mortal flesh, our lowly condition. He laid it aside, in obedience and in love, "being put to death in the flesh but made alive in the spirit" — a life which we can share with him even now and will share with him fully, if we are but faithful, hereafter. (11) We know little of our future risen life, and it is clear that God does not intend us to, Faith is enough. After Easter, our Lord could eat and drink with his disciples — not because he needed to, but in order to show them that he was the same Jesus whom they had known and loved. He is constantly reassuring his disciples:

"Let not your heart be troubled; you believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house there are many rooms; if it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you? (12)

In many similar passages he shows himself as the "bridge-builder", who has gone before us and, more importantly, *with whom* we travel to our eternal destiny.

Although there will be "a new heaven and a new earth" (13), this *transformation* will be precisely on account of the people who have reached the fulfilment which God intends. In our present existence, too, it is people, not things, that matter. We may think of a Catholic scientist, with not a great deal of interest in "animal functions and pleasures", but wondering what is the purpose of all his research if ultimately the present order of things is, like himself, doomed to die. He should consider what the Vatican Council said

(10) de Lubac, *loc. cit.*, slightly adapted.

(11) I Peter 3, 18; cf. Romans 8, 10-11.

(12) John 14, 1-3. (13) Revelation 21, 1-4.

on the value of human activity. Here we have space only for a brief quotation:

"Just as human activity proceeds from man, so it is ordered toward man. For when a man works he not only alters things and society, he develops himself as well . . . Rightly understood, this kind of growth is of greater value than any external riches which can be garnered. A man is more precious for what he is than for what he has. Similarly, all that men do to obtain greater justice, wider brotherhood, and a more humane ordering of human relationships has greater worth than technical advances. For these advances can supply the material for human progress, but of themselves alone they can never actually bring it about."

And a little further on, in speaking of man's final destiny:

"While we are warned that it profits a man nothing if he gain the whole world and lose himself, the expectation of a new earth must not weaken but rather stimulate our concern for cultivating this one . . . For after we have obeyed the Lord, and in his Spirit nurtured on earth the values of human dignity, brotherhood and freedom, and indeed all the good fruits of our nature and enterprise, we will find them again, but freed from stain, burnished and transfigured".<sup>(14)</sup>

Earthly things are means, not ends. In themselves we are right to set no store by them. As means we have to use them, so far as we need them in co-operating with God's purposes. They may, indeed, become in this way a part of our human make-up. In that case we shall not lose them, but "find them again, but freed from stain, burnished and transfigured". Is there anything lacking now to the glorified human nature of our Lord? Neither will there be to our own true humanity.

---

(14) *Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, 34-35 & 39.

The ancient Latin liturgy of the Roman Church, like all living and organic things, took some five hundred years to develop until it reached its definite form about the time of Pope Gregory the Great — and has remained virtually unchanged to this day. The New Order of Mass was “evolved” in the space of half a decade and marks a radical shift in language, form and emphasis from the Mass which so splendidly served the Church for the past millennium and a half.

## The New Liturgy — Loss or Gain ?

By DENZIL GALVIN

LET me say straight away that I am not one of those ultra-traditionalists in the Church who assert that the new rite of Mass has lost its doctrinal validity by virtue of its changed form and emphasis. It falls upon all Catholics loyally to accept the revised rite authorised by the *Magisterium* because it would be unthinkable that the theology of the Mass had not been as validly preserved in the new form of worship as in the old. The *language* and *form* of the new Mass are a different matter because they emanate from the human and ecclesiastical side of the Church. The Second Vatican Council, as Catholics like Mr. St. John-Stewas are always reminding us, opened up an era of freedom of debate and discussion on the renewal of the Church in the modern world, although “renewal” to these Neo-Modernists or progressives means questioning if not dissenting from the authentic doctrinal and moral teaching of the Church, as we saw in the case of *Humanae Vitae*. Surely, then, when it comes to a matter of *discipline* such as

the language, form and emphasis of the New Order of Mass, loyalist Catholics, in the same spirit of open discussion, have an equal right to ask respectfully whether the timing and nature of these changes in the liturgy are in harmony with right reason and wisdom at a time when the Church is beset by uncertainties and dissent.

Successful revolutionaries always justify their new regime by denigrating all that has gone before. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that the official liturgical reformists in the Church, as well as the progressives, seek to promote the new Mass by depicting the old liturgy as a largely remote and incomprehensible form of worship which prevented the meaningful participation of the people in the past. If that were true, what a confession of failure in communication on the part of the Church! Indeed why should a Catholic have any more faith in the arguments put forward on behalf of the new rite when at the same time he is told that the Church has tolerated an ineffectual liturgy over the centuries? If this were so, then why did not Pius XII tell us so in his great encyclical on the liturgy (*Mediator Dei*, 1947), instead of extolling the virtues of the ancient Roman Mass? The charge that the old liturgy militated against the rightful participation of the people does not stand up to examination. For fifteen hundred years the historic Roman Mass has expressed the Christ-given Eucharistic doctrines in a precise and unchanging language and in a sacred choreography of movement, gesture and symbolism that *communicated* the hidden realities of the Sacrifice to the hearts, minds and imaginations of countless generations of Catholics. It was uncompromising in that its rocklike language and form left no loophole for those who might wish to adapt the Mass to the transient moods and fashions of the day.

The religious instinct depends upon hallowed associations and the essence of true worship does just that by working through the elemental responses in the human soul rather than through formalised and reflexive actions on the part of the worshippers — even though these have their role



As E. I. Watkin pointed out in his book, *Catholic Art and Culture*, "contemplative prayer is the natural conclusion of genuine and intelligent worship, without which no exterior Catholic action can be fruitful". In contrast to the new rite — where worship is measured in decibels and opportunities for contemplation banished — the old Roman Mass possessed that awe, beauty, dignified progression and precious moments of silence where a soul could surrender itself to God and to the realities of the Sacrifice offered. This is no mere aesthetic argument. The Mass had that indefinable *frisson* which throughout the centuries enabled the medieval peasant or the Breton countryman of today — no less than the educated — to feel they were in communication with and edified by the Mystery enacted before them.

Perhaps the greatest proof that the ancient Roman liturgy was fully comprehended by and integrated into the lives of the faithful is evidenced by the very physical expression of their worship. Regard the great cathedrals and the myriad of parish churches which beautify the face of Europe and this country. These edifices were literally built by simple artisans and artists to create a living symmetry of space and shape for the enactment of the Mass. The people's instinctive understanding of God, the Church and her liturgy was gloriously expressed in stone, glass, fresco and mural. The result was Art — hardly a reflection of incomprehension of what the Mass was all about! In more recent times, the Catholic who travelled through the countries of Europe and beyond, attending Mass in some great cathedral or little village church, could not fail to be impressed by the fact that, in whatever country he might be, the universal Latin singposted the familiar progression of the Mass. In time of war or when Catholic countries groaned under the oppression of the occupying power, who has not experienced or read about how the faithful found in the Mass an unfailing source of personal spiritual comfort and a communal sense of strength in the face of the prevailing powers of darkness.

The Mass was all things to all men; a unique and sacred

respository from which the people drew their source of contemplation of the divine and way of worship according to their own needs and temperaments. In *Mediator Dei* Pius XII continually emphasised this essential character of the Mass. Referring to the external actions of the people in the Mass, he continued:

"It must be understood that they are by no means necessary to give the Mass its public and communal character . . . it would be wrong and irrational to exaggerate the importance of these incidental circumstances to the extent of saying that without them the Sacrifice cannot achieve its purpose . . . a great number of the faithful are incapable of using the Roman Missal even in the vernacular. Nor are all equal to a proper understanding of the rites and formulas of the liturgy. People differ so widely in character, temperament and intelligence that it is impossible for them all to be affected in the same way by the same communal prayers, hymns and sacred actions. Spiritual needs and dispositions are not the same in all, nor do these remain unchanged in the same individual at different times."

Contrast this solemn interpretation of the diversity of involvement in the Mass, uttered comparatively recently by a Pope, with the brainwashing to which the faithful are subjected to today which postulates an almost frenetic "participation" in the Mass before personal piety and communion with God so that the individual way in which one wishes to worship is made impossible amidst a plethora of continuous vocalising and "group activity" directed by the "president" or priest.

Turning now to what might be called the *lingua missa* of the Holy Sacrifice, it is a truism to say that the language in which it is offered is incidental to the great realities of the Mass — Sacrifice, Real Presence and the graces flowing therefrom. Nevertheless, it must be recognised that, with all reverence, these truths remain an abstraction to the worshipper unless they are made meaningful and fruit-

ful through the media of language and ritual. The Church in her wisdom considered that the Roman Mass, clothed in a precise language and form which prevented any deviations from these Eucharistic truths, fulfilled this requirement during the past fifteen hundred years.

Then came the Second Vatican Council, which in its decree on the liturgy, gave initial permission for the vernacular to be introduced into the Mass. Unfortunately this particular passage on the vernacular was expressed in ambiguous language so that even the progressively minded *Tablet* commented at the time that "it can indeed be truly urged that the liturgical constitution of Vatican II might well have stated the case for Latin much more exhaustively and forcibly . . . that while national hierarchies were expected to move towards the vernacular, the Council was not equally concerned that they should also preserve the Latin". It was the thin edge of the wedge, forced wider and wider apart by both the official reformists and the Neo-Modernists who were determined to banish Latin to a liturgical limbo, not to mention the soft-pedalling of the central sacrificial nature of the Mass in favour of a "meal" or "assembly" by the People of God. Today, national hierarchies and most of the clergy pay lip-service (or none at all) to Rome's repeated instructions that the faithful must be kept fully familiarised with Latin in those parts of the Mass rightfully theirs; they construe the obedient silence of the people for acquiescence in the changes, acquiescence for whole-hearted acceptance. There is an almost callous indifference towards the grief of those who feel bereft of a priceless spiritual heritage. Yet recall what recent Popes have solemnly declared about the importance of actively and purposively retaining Latin in the liturgy:

"The use of the Latin language prevailing in a great part of the Church affords at once an imposing sign of unity and an effective safeguard against the corruption of true doctrine" (Pius XII in *Mediator Dei*, 1947).

"The Church's language must not only be universal

but also immutable. Modern languages are liable to change. Thus if the truths of the Church were entrusted to them, the meanings of these truths would not be manifested to everyone with sufficient clarity and precision . . . Latin is indeed such a language. It is set and unchanging . . . The bishops shall be on their guard lest anyone being eager for innovation writes against the use of Latin in the highest studies or in the liturgy" (Pope John in *Veterum Sapientia*, 1962).

Is there not registered a traumatic shock by this *volte-face* in the Church's attitude towards the pre-eminence of Latin in her liturgy? This is not true "development" but a liturgical landslide completely out of character with the cautious wisdom about hasty changes displayed by the Church throughout all her history. These changes are both untimely and short-sighted. Untimely, because in an age of moral and social upheaval, Catholics should be able to draw strength from a familiar form of worship especially when they see around them the apparent breakdown of once cherished disciplines in the Church; when the very authority of the See of Peter, when it pronounces on doctrinal and moral teaching, is questioned or even rejected by so-called Catholics. Short-sighted, because this indecent haste to relegate Latin to a kind of revered relic to be intermittently brought out and dusted to conform to ambiguous liturgical directives reveal an uncharacteristic lack of prescience on the part of the Church in the light of the lessons of history. For it is not enough for our spiritual shepherds to say that Latin will still be preserved in the liturgy. What will that mean in practice? That Latin Masses will still be regularly performed in the cathedrals and greater churches of the Catholic world but elsewhere for most of the 600 million Catholics a knowledge of the liturgy in Latin will become a dead-letter, judging by the "with-it" enthusiasm for the new "popular" vernacular rite displayed by most of the clergy. Each national Church's worship will gradually revert into a narrow linguistic compartment of its own. It is here the lessons of history apply.

During the Dark Ages, when European civilisation was crumbling under the inroads of the barbarian invaders, it was the Church alone which kept burning the torch of the Christian message and culture. Men like Alcuin, Boniface and Columbanus went forth to the disrupted Catholic nations of Europe — to whom they were foreigners — reforming and rebuilding the shattered Church, its liturgy and its organisation. As historians like Christopher Dawson and Arnold Toynbee have pointed out, their task was immeasurably eased because a live, uniform and universal liturgical language (common to those missionary shock-troops of the Church) crossed linguistic frontiers and acted as a catalyst in restoring religious contact between nations and their identity and unity with the See of Peter. Who can doubt how much more difficult their task would have been if each country had been immured in its own vernacular liturgy? Today we live in the shadow of atomic and biological warfare, not to mention the possibility of a universal pestilence due to our wanton pollution of nature — and it is therefore not fanciful to say that such a cataclysm could occur again in the Western world and in the life and organisation of the Church. The lesson surely is that, as a re-insurance against the occurrent disasters of history, it is more imperative than ever that the Church should keep the unifying and universal advantages of Latin vigourously alive both in her seminaries and in the liturgy of the diverse nations in her fold.

The New Order of Mass, intended to be pluralistic and adaptable for "participation" by the people, vulnerable to the changing nuances and corruption of national language, could not have been introduced at a more inopportune moment in the life of the Church. The whole form and emphasis of the new rite unpardonably drains the Mass of its essential *afflatus* — that emanation of the transcendental and the divine — by seemingly making the mistake of equating participation with communication. Just as a person can incessantly talk without really conversing, the overwhelming vocal and activist involvement of the people



in the new Mass (a necessary element up to a point) is not always a sign they are in *communication* with or *illuminated* by the sacred realities of the Sacrifice. Certainly the endless "happenings" leave no time for personal piety or surrender to God. The blurring of the priest's awesome role — the representative of Christ re-enacting the Sacrifice of Calvary — into a kind of "president" or "master of ceremonies", the relegation of altar and tabernacle in favour of a "table", the physical involvement of the people at the Offertory with those once sacred objects, the vessels and wafers, the whittling away of the acts of obeisance and genuflection in the ritual — all combine to kill that spirit of reverence and mystery which is the hallmark of true worship; that sense, which the ancient Mass so richly irradiated, of being in the presence of the Holy of Holies. Judaism has never made that mistake.

Of course the Mass is a communal act — I am not disputing that — but *Mediator Dei* wisely warned against an exaggerated emphasis on congregational participation and of reviving Early Church customs in the ritual merely for the sake of change. The danger of the current obsession with "participation" is that it can so easily slide into a form of self-expression, if not self-esteem. Whereas before in the Mass, the Mystery was the message, the medium is now becoming the message. Their eyes turned away from tabernacle and altar, our earnest reformers and radicals are more concerned with the personal satisfaction to be gained from innovation, experimentation and a distorted Christian communalism. The logical conclusion of their ideas and of the mundanity of the new liturgy can be seen in churches now built or being designed for that purpose. Austere Mass-rooms or communal worship rooms (as they are sometimes called), stripped of every embellishment to stimulate piety, a bare table (altar), the Real Presence banished to a side-chapel or room, and — the ultimate profanity — in one new proposed church in this country, after Mass a sliding door opens up a coffee-bar in full view of the sanctuary. *O tempora! O mores!*

The new rite (in contrast to the doctrinal exactitude expressed in the language and form of the old Mass) is so "open-ended" in its desire to be "contemporaneous" and "democratic", that it is already encouraging all those in the Church who wish to drain the sacred and the sublime, if not its true significance, from the Mass. There is the ever present temptation, as we are witnessing in America, in Holland and certain other Continental countries, of using the new liturgy as a vehicle for "coming to terms" with the social and political ideas of the modern world; as a "Eucharistic Meal" to further association or even inter-communion with the Protestant Churches; (the fact that a number of Protestant theologians have welcomed the new rite is ominous in itself); or as a "folk" or "beat" Mass to appeal to the younger generation. In contrast to the uncompromising integrity and timelessness of the old Mass, let all these "renewalists" remember this: nothing dates so quickly as that deemed to be "contemporary", nothing degenerates so inevitably into passivity as which tries to be "popular". After the 10,000th "And with you" or "Thanks be to God" from congregations, the new rite will revert to a formalism of its own — with which the ancient Mass is so often charged. As Walter Bagehot once cautioned against "popularisation" of the unique and semi-mystic qualities of the British monarchy "it is dangerous to let in too much light upon magic".

So what has been gained by all these changes in the hallowed worship of the Church? That almost the whole of the splendid poetry and mystery of the old Mass has been destroyed, not in totality, but picked at and chipped away piecemeal, leaving a curiously blurred and unsatisfactory effect. There is not the slightest evidence that the changes will add to the illumination of Christian doctrine, help to convert a single person of deep sensibility to Catholicism, or confirm and deepen the faith of those Catholics who found in the Mass a mystical source of personal communion with God and the Sacrifice of His Son. Perhaps it is fitting to conclude by quoting the prescient remarks made by Fr.

Aelred Graham OSB in an article published in the *Tablet* (1. 3. '69.)

"Where the faithful may have been unintentionally misled is by the changes in the manner of public worship. Let full recognition be given to the merits of the liturgical renewal; the fact remains, as Confucius pointed out long ago, that to interfere with the public rites is to touch the very fabric of government. Future historians may well conclude that the Church brought upon herself her present unsettled state, not in the first place by any insistence on traditional morality, but by embarking without sufficient consideration on a whole series of relatively superficial, though to many sensibilities, drastic changes in the conduct of her public worship."

---

## *Edmund Campion's Days*

"Campion found his Catholic hosts impoverished to the verge of ruin by the recusancy fines; often the household were in mourning for one or more of their number who had been removed to prison . . . yet everywhere he was amazed at the constancy and devotion which he found. The listless, yawning days were over, the half hour's duty perfunctorily accorded on days of obligation. Catholics no longer chose their chaplain for his speed in saying Mass, or kept Boccaccio bound in the covers of their missals. Driven back to the life of the catacombs, the Church was recovering their temper. No one now complained of the length of the services . . . if a Mass did not last nearly an hour they were discontented . . ."

From *Edmund Campion*, by Evelyn Waugh.

Was Our Lord, in his human nature, capable of sinning? If not, how is he an example for us sinners? Why did the idea of Collegiality take so long to gain acceptance in the Church? Why are little children the standard for entry into the Kingdom of Heaven?

## Any Questions ?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Was Our Lord, in his human nature, capable of sinning? If not, how is he an example for us sinners?

The great heretic, Arius, whose false doctrines disrupted the Church in the fourth century, taught that Christ could have sinned, but did not. According to him, Our Lord was not God. He therefore avoided the mystery of the union in one Divine Person of two natures. He and his doctrines were condemned at the Council of Nicaea.

The natural human desire to understand fully has led many Christians, especially in the early centuries of the Church, to cut down Christian doctrine to a comprehensible size — to make Our Lord's teaching and the tradition of the Apostles naturally intelligible before they are accepted as truth. That is the basic error of rationalism, and it means the rejection of faith as the chief source of our religious knowledge. The heresies about the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation were countered by definitions of the *Magisterium*; but there is a persistent tendency to bring divine truth down to our level. It shows itself in the recurrent trick of making our human nature the standard for measurement of the human nature of Christ. We are sinful, so our Lord must have been capable of sin. With us, "temptation" can be the preliminary to sin, so the outcome

of the temptations in the desert must have been uncertain to the end.

The mistake arises partly from a common misunderstanding of freedom. Our freedom expresses itself as choice, sometimes as choice between good and evil. We think that if there is no choice, no alternative to the course we adopt, there is no freedom. That is not true. The need to choose between good and evil implies a double-mindedness which, from Our Lord's example, we should grow out of. We are on the way to freedom when we do not sin; but it is only when we cannot sin that we are perfectly free.

### **Why did the idea of collegiality take so long to gain acceptance in the Church ?**

It may seem capitious to ask you what about the Council of Jerusalem in 49 A.D., but I think my question is fair. The *fact* of collegiality—the union of the Apostles under St. Peter, and the union of their successors under the Pope—has been present in the Church throughout her existence. The acceptance of it in action—in the exercise of collegial authority—is plain to see in the General Councils. The practical extension of collegial action has varied according to circumstances. Full-scale meetings of the College have necessarily been rare — the Second Vatican Council was only the twenty-first in history. Association between the Head of the College and its members has been maintained in many ways: correspondence, *ad limina* visits of bishops to Rome, and visits of the Pope in person or of his legates to local councils, hierarchies and civil rulers. The speeding-up of communications in the last few decades has made collegiate exercise of authority a practical proposition, and during the next few years, in the light of the teaching of the recent Council and Synod, ways and means will be sought of extending such exercise, to the great benefit of the Church (and, I should think, to the relief of the Pope, who should have help in bearing his huge burden).

There are difficulties in the application of the doctrine



of collegiality. To recall them is not to reject "the idea of collegiality" but simply to face facts. One difficulty is avoidable if the terms suitable to civil government—absolute monarchy, constitutional monarchy, parliamentary government—are kept out of the debates: they do not apply to the Church. Other difficulties are unavoidable, like the vulnerability of national hierarchies (witness the defection of the English hierarchy under Henry VIII and the Gallicanism of generations of French bishops) which continues to be tested by the new tyrannies.

### **Why are little children the standard for entry into the kingdom of heaven?**

Not because of the attractiveness of their tender years, which is ephemeral and superficial; nor because of their so-called "innocence", which is ignorance, and unconsciousness of human personality and its demands. They provide a standard because their freshness is a reminder that Christian life is a new birth and a new beginning—"Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven".

Some of the characteristics of children, though not conscious enough to be virtue, may be considered for their silent condemnation of adults who have developed opposite characteristics which are blameworthy. Children, for example, are direct in their relations with people. They get at once to the person, and are not held back by colour, class, clothes and other accidents. They are not snobs until they learn snobbery from their elders and betters. Their selfishness is primitive and spasmodic, not sophisticated, self-justifying and obsessive. They are trustful: they believe anything they are told. That makes them gullible; but it also saves them from cynicism, mistrust, and a sour search for hidden motives behind what they are told. They are avid for learning, so they make good disciples and are amenable to discipline.

In our human relations we should certainly be more

companionable if we could carry a measure of childlikeness with us through the years. In our relationship with Christ we must have some of the characteristics of children in order that we may learn from him. If we are "wise and prudent" in our own conceit we fail to be his disciples; and without his discipline we stay fatally ignorant.

**Would it be possible for Jesuits to convert Communists? Has it ever been tried? Why not, after all?**

It is kind of you to suggest Jesuits for the job—I am supposing that you mean it kindly—but I do not know that the few specialists among them on communism are any more qualified than experts in other Orders.

There have been discussions between Christians and communists in which one or two Jesuits have taken part; and the Church, since the Second Vatican Council has a new openness to the communist world. But I think it is particularly important in this matter to be realistic. There have been conversions of communists to Christianity; but I have the impression that they have surrendered to the Holy Spirit and were already "converted" when they approached a priest. It would be naive to think that the communists taking part in official discussions with Catholics have any interest in religion except as a social phenomenon which they object to as an obstacle—the only solid obstacle—in the way of their expansion. Such communists as are allowed to enter into peaceful exchanges with the Church are not like the communists in *The Little World of Don Camillo*, whose rivalry with the parish priest is respectful and somewhat affectionate. They start with a firm disbelief in God, and they stick to it. It is not just the background of a deep concern for humanity, as it can be with humanists: it is a basic political tenet. Co-operation with humanists in the works of mercy could be undertaken, I think, without seeming to give their atheism a blessing; but communism never deviates from its one-track policy, and to go along with them at all is to seem to go the whole way.

In any case, who are the communists? Not the intellectuals, but the few politicians who have absolute power. They are not open to discussion.

Is it reasonable to say, of priests who have left their state of life and want to marry, that vocation to the priesthood has been followed by a vocation to marriage?

It has been said, I know, apropos of one or two well-publicised departures from the priesthood. It is not at all reasonable. For one thing, it offends against reason by using the word "vocation" as though it applied equally to priesthood and marriage. It doesn't. All Christians are called to union with God and a full service of Him in loving observance of His Commandments. Most follow that calling in the straightforward establishment of human relations in society, above all the key social group of the family. They need no special call from God to enter the married state: the inclination to enter it is rooted in their nature and is strengthened by the gift of supernatural life which makes marriage so much happier. Some few are called away from that human fulfilment; and that calling is "vocation" in the traditional sense.

Where there is a married clergy, the priests have not two vocations but one; and the question, raised from the first preaching of the gospel, about the best way of answering the vocation, has been settled by the Church's insistence for centuries, reaffirmed yet again by Paul VI, on celibacy. Vocation to the priesthood is according to what the Church requires of priests, and it is therefore, in practice, a vocation to celibacy; and as the call from Christ to close companionship with Him is of its nature permanent, so is the condition set by the Church for that companionship.

God does not summon His creatures into a state in which they cannot be fulfilled. On the contrary He requires and enables them to make a perfection of their supernaturalised humanity.

## Is cursing permitted in certain circumstances?

To be justified and effective, cursing, as opposed to blessing, must be the act of one who has authority over the beings that are cursed. In the New Testament, Our Lord pronounced the curse which will fall on any who refuse the grace of God at the last: "Depart from me, ye cursed." Against the hypocrites in high places He uttered the opposite of the beatitudes: "Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees" and, as an example to the spiritually unfruitful, He cursed the barren fig tree. On most solemn occasions, and for the gravest of reasons, the Church uses comminations—threats of divine vengeance—against any of her members who contumaciously deny revealed truth. The ordinary person has no authority to curse; and Christ expressly forbids us to call down evil on our fellows. To no one may we say "Thou fool"—a curse, not just a charge of stupidity. If we have enemies we must pray for them, and we must return good for evil.

The fictitious archbishop who cursed the thief who had taken his ring, and who found that the curse had fallen on "The Jackdaw of Rheims", would have had to make up his formula for cursing: the Roman Ritual does not provide one. It contains a great number of blessings, for people and for things. It has only one formula which is anything like a curse—what it calls "a deprecatory blessing." It is a set of prayers against "persecution" by pests: flies, locusts, grubs, and worms, invoking the power of God against them, and begging Him that, by the instrumentality of His minister, "cursing, He will curse them, segregating He will segregate them and exterminating He will exterminate them."

The prayers against pestiferous animalcules can be used by a priest with episcopal permission.

## BOOK REVIEW

# Full of Sound and Fury

(AMATEURS AT WORK)

**Scandal in the Assembly.** By Morris West and Robert Francis (Pan Books: 6s).

Anyone wishing to learn about the working of the marriage-courts of the Church can do so from *Marriage Annulment*, the new book of Fr. Ralph Brown, recently published by Geoffrey Chapman. But the two authors of this tract under review, one a successful novelist and the other a non-Catholic journalist, want a different kind of Church and the scrapping of most of the marriage law of the Church for reasons best known to themselves. Neither discloses his interest at the outset, though one gathers that the journalist spent a year studying (as some canon law students do) at the Rota in Rome without disclosing his whole reason for doing so. He is able to report that the judges are incorruptible. One wonders how he knows. Did he try bribery and get a refusal?

Inconsistency is the foe of all amateur theologians, and the West-Francis combination has not escaped the trap. The authors start off (p. 20) with the fine sentiment that sacramental marriage, "is a means by which the gift of God is perpetuated for husband and wife, for their children and the assembly of believers". On p. 78 they still recognise that the gift of faith is conferred upon infants (without their consent or dissent) by the sacrament of baptism. But, then, the basis of the reform they seek is said to be (p. 93) that it is only, "when a man accepts to remain open to God's disposal and to act freely in concert with his Creator that he becomes a Christian". Infants, then, are not Christians, even though they are baptised. Later on (p. 150) it emerges that, "the faithful themselves establish a union



of love (also called the Christian assembly) by their common assent to Christ and His teaching". The ghost of Pelagius walks again. Only those who are devoid of a sense of the divine initiative in the mission of Christ and the founding of the Church could assent to this fantasy. God *could* have chosen some other means of propagating His Church than infant baptism and in His mercy He *does* provide for the accession of converts in adult age, but the plain fact is that from the time of the apostles infant baptism has been the gate of the Church and no Pelagius is going to alter it now.

There are tools of the theologian which cut the hand of their user unless he be practised. The authors quote Leo the Great for the maxim that he who is to rule all should be chosen by all, and they go on to claim that apostolic authority is conferred by election. They are apparently unaware that there is a distinction between what even a heretic like Priscillian (some sixty years before Leo) called *dedicatio* and *electio*; the people may elect their bishop, but unless he receives consecration he remains a man of straw. "The hierarchy", these authors tell us, "is a function of the assembly" (p. 105), and one is left to infer that the assembly can make that function equal to zero. Leo the Great, in the letter from which they quote, was engaged in restoring to his see by exercise of papal authority a bishop who had been wrongfully deposed. This was not quite a function of the assembly.

A chapter is devoted to lining up instances of the allowance of divorce by Catholic bishops or local councils in the past. About this list, culled from the work of a disgruntled Slav in the U.S.A., it needs to be said that many of the instances are pronouncements that the innocent wife must part from her husband if he has committed adultery, not that she might marry afresh, but because it was considered to be sinful for her to condone his sin by continuing her relations with him. It is well known that some Byzantine canonists accepted the lawfulness of divorce, largely owing to the influence of the laws of Justinian, but St. Basil and Epiphanius cannot be recruited

for that gallery, as any reader of Fr. Joyce's *Christian Marriage* will know. Theodore of Tarsus, who came to Canterbury just 1300 years ago, is claimed by Mr. West, (or is it Mr. Francis?) as a supporter, and with sublime disregard for scholarship it is alleged that, "his surviving writings are contained in a document called the Penitential of Theodore". The synod of Hertford which Theodore convoked in 673, is indeed mentioned, but there is no mention of its decree; "If any man has driven away his lawfully wedded wife, he must not be married to another, if he wish to be a proper Christian; let him stay as he is or be reconciled to his wife". The so-called *Penitential* of Theodore is not his composition, but the work of a Northumbrian monk with no authority. The monk may have been using some of the decisions given by Theodore, but he may equally have been moved to mitigate for Anglo-Saxon nobles the rigour of Celtic Penitentials, in one of which one may read a ruling ascribed to Theodore ordering seven years hard penance for one who divorces his wife and takes another, or twelve years milder penance.

At the height of the Modernist crisis von Hugel wrote about the law of the Church: "The idea that everything legal is essentially evil is but a sorry Gnosticism or a pathetic excess". Mr. West has not gone quite to this length, and he seems aware that the greatest source of difficulty about marriage law is the survival in canon law of concepts drawn from the Roman civil law. The present writer had something to say about this at a meeting in Rome of the Academy of St. Thomas in 1960, and his ideas were taken up in the Vatican decree on religious liberty. What Mr. West is blind to is the way in which ideas from the English common law are making their way against the vestigial paganisms of the Roman civil law. If he had confined his tract to this problem, he might have done some good; but he drags in the conflict between lawyers and doctors, which is now common to all legal systems, and he upbraids the Rota for having a means test before granting legal aid, a test that he would find in existence elsewhere. He is carried away by

rhetoric when he writes: "Marriage is a saving mystery or sacrament. For one not involved to dare to legislate for such a mystery is a presumption that passes understanding". But Christ is involved in every sacramental marriage, for His union with the Church is the prototype of that mystery, and Christ legislated for Christian marriage by His prohibition of divorce. He further saw to it that guardianship of the sacraments was left to the authorities of His Church. If anyone presumes, it is Mr. West.

The authors have found "a Nordic bishop" who, with a singular lack of collegiality, tells some of his flock who are invalidly married that they can receive communion. One would like to know what he does when the case is as follows: a Catholic woman married to a seaman is told that her husband "missed his ship" in Singapore. When she hears nothing from him for six months, she starts to live with another Catholic man and has a child by him. The Nordic bishop tells her she can go to communion as if validly married to the second man. After three years the seaman husband turns up. What would the Nordic bishop say to him? The idea that all marriage tangles could be sorted out in the confessional, as the Nordic bishop believes, is manifestly unjust, as the other party to the suit is never represented there.

*Joseph Crehan, S. J.*